

REMARKS

Claims 1–22 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 12 are amended herewith.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103

Claims 1–5, 8, 12–16, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Reisman (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0031058.)

The Examiner further rejected claims 6, 7, 9–11, 17, 18 and 20–22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reisman in view of Kalika et al (US Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0054670.)

Favorable reconsideration of this rejection in view of the above amendments and the following explanation is respectfully requested.

As stated in the previous response, Reisman teaches a method and apparatus for browsing using alternative linkbases. His teaching provides Internet or wireless connections to a home LAN where return channels are available to allow for interactivity. He even states that the home network may be a LAN, and that the LAN may be wireless.

However a home LAN does not, even possibly, not even maybe, include relay stations, certainly not relay stations that include other users, and certainly not relay stations that are rooftop receiver installations. A home LAN would by definition not be a home LAN if it included a two or more rooftop receiver installations.

Rather a home LAN has a wireless modem which transmits to available wireless cards in the house. There are no intermediate users, because it is a home LAN. Even if the Examiner insists that other home computers count as separate users, they do not relay the signal, since a home wireless LAN is star connected about a central hub. However even if the Examiner can find a home wireless LAN that relays over available nodes then this still does not anticipate the claim because the claim defines that the nodes are rooftop installations.

Reisman teaches a return link. Reisman further teaches a wireless link. Reisman does not however teach that the wireless link is the return link – The wireless link is merely the internal LAN. The claim by contrast requires a return link that includes rooftop broadcast receiver installations of the users which form relay nodes of the wireless network.

Thus the wireless link of Reisman does not include rooftop installations. The return link of Reisman merely includes the Internet or wireless network 126. Again, network 126 is a cellular wireless network – see paragraph 98 - and so does not teach relay nodes including rooftop broadcast receiving installations. It is related as common general knowledge of the skilled person that there is no broadcasting on a cellular network since all signals are meant for specific recipients.

That is to say Reisman fails to teach or even hint that the return channel is a wireless terrestrial network made up relay stations which are nodes, being rooftop broadcast receiver installations.

The same amendments have been made to independent claim 12.

The remaining claims mentioned in this section of the Office Action are believed to be allowable as being dependent on an allowable main claim.

All of the matters raised by the Examiner have been dealt with and are believed to have been overcome.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are allowable.

An early Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin D. Moynihan
Registration No. 40,338

Date: September 8, 2008

Enclosed:

Request for Continued Examination (RCE)
Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)